

1  
2  
3  
4 MATTHEW JOHNSON,  
5 Plaintiff,

6 Case No. [10-cv-04147-JSW](#)  
7  
8 v.  
9

10 COMCAST OF  
11 CALIFORNIA/COLORADO/  
WASHINGTON I, INC,  
12 Defendant.

13 DUSTIN POOLE,  
14 Plaintiff,

15 Case No. [13-cv-03772-JSW](#)  
16 v.  
17

18 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
19 Defendants.

20 DANIEL CANADAY, et al.,  
21 Plaintiffs,

22 Case No. [15-cv-04648-JSW](#)  
23 v.  
24

25 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
26 Defendants.

27 EDMUNDO ORTEGA, JR., et al.,  
28 Plaintiffs,

29 v.  
30

31 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
32 Defendants.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 JASON WILLIAMS, et al.,  
2 Plaintiffs,  
3 v.  
4 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
5 Defendants.  
6 LAMBERTO VALENCIA, et al.,  
7 Plaintiffs,  
8 v.  
9 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
10 Defendants.  
11 JEFFREY COLEMAN, et al.,  
12 Plaintiffs,  
13 v.  
14 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
15 Defendants.  
16 RICHARD NELSON, et al.,  
17 Plaintiffs,  
18 v.  
19 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
20 Defendants.  
21 CALEB DUBOIS, et al.,  
22 Plaintiffs,  
23 v.  
24 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
25 Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-04732-JSW](#)

Case No. [15-cv-04771-JSW](#)

Case No. [15-cv-04782-JSW](#)

Case No. [15-cv-04793-JSW](#)

Case No. [15-cv-04809-JSW](#)

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 GREGORY PETERS, et al.,  
2 Plaintiffs,  
3 v.  
4 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
5 Defendants.  
6 LUPE LANDIN, JR., et al.,  
7 Plaintiffs,  
8 v.  
9 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
10 Defendants.  
11 CORY BARRETT HALL,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 v.  
14 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA, INC., et  
15 al.,  
16 Defendants.  
17 FRANCISCO FLORES, et al.,  
18 Plaintiffs,  
19 v.  
20 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
21 Defendants.  
22 JOSEPH JOSHUA DAVIS, et al.,  
23 Plaintiffs,  
24 v.  
25 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,  
26 Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-04869-JSW](#)

Case No. [16-cv-04174-JSW](#)

Case No. [16-cv-04175-JSW](#)

Case No. [16-cv-04176-JSW](#)

Case No. [16-cv-04177-JSW](#)

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1	JAMES K. GRIMES, et al.,	Case No. <a href="#">16-cv-04178-JSW</a>
2	Plaintiffs,	
3	v.	
4	COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,	
5	Defendants.	
6	STEPHEN MCBRIDE, et al.,	Case No. <a href="#">16-cv-04179-JSW</a>
7	Plaintiffs,	
8	v.	
9	COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,	
10	Defendants.	
11	LAWRENCE ELKINS, et al.,	Case No. <a href="#">16-cv-04180-JSW</a>
12	Plaintiffs,	
13	v.	
14	COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16	HERNAN PAEZ, et al.,	Case No. <a href="#">16-cv-04181-JSW</a>
17	Plaintiffs,	
18	v.	
19	COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,	
20	Defendants.	
21	KRIS COOK, et al.,	Case No. <a href="#">16-cv-04182-JSW</a>
22	Plaintiffs,	
23	v.	
24	COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,	
25	Defendants.	
26		
27		
28		

1 KEVIN HUFFMAN, et al.,

2 Plaintiffs,

3 v.

4 COMCAST CORPORATION, et al.,

5 Defendants.

Case No. [16-cv-04183-JSW](#)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**ORDER RELATING  
TRANSFERRED CASES; CONTINUING  
CASE MANAGEMENT  
CONFERENCES IN RELATED CASES;  
DEFERRING RULING ON WHETHER  
STAYED CASES ARE RELATED; AND  
REQUIRING STATUS REPORT RE  
STAYED CASES**

**1. The Transferred Cases Are Related.**

On July 21, 2016, the Eastern District of California transferred ten cases to this Court. *See Landin v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04174-JSW; *Hall v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04175-JSW; *Flores v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04176-JSW; *Davis v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04177-JSW; *Grimes v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04178-JSW; *McBride v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04179-JSW; *Elkins v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04180-JSW; *Paez v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04181-JSW; *Cook v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04182-JSW; *Huffman v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04183-JSW (collectively, the “transferred cases”). By order of the Executive Committee of this Court, all ten cases were assigned to the undersigned.

On January 15, 2016, the Eastern District of California had ordered that these ten transferred cases were related to each other within the meaning of Eastern District of California Local Rule 123(a). Following transfer of the ten cases to this Court, Plaintiffs filed a motion to relate the ten cases to eight related cases already pending before the undersigned: *Canaday v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04648-JSW; *Ortega v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04676-JSW; *Williams v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04732-JSW; *Valencia v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04771-JSW; *Coleman v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04782-JSW; *Nelson v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04793-JSW; *DuBois v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04809-JSW; and *Peters v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04869-JSW. Defendants responded that they do not believe that the cases meet the definition set forth in Civil Local Rule 3-12(a), but that they have no objection to coordination of the cases for purposes of discovery or deciding common legal issues.

Upon review of the record, the Court finds that each of the ten transferred cases IS

1 RELATED to *Canaday v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04648-JSW, and all other cases related to  
2 *Canaday*, as defined by Civil Local Rule 3-12. Accordingly, the Court GRANTS the motion to  
3 relate the cases. Because the cases are already assigned to the undersigned, further reassignment  
4 is not necessary.

5 **2. The Court Continues the Case Management Conferences in the Related Cases.**

6 Case management conferences in all eighteen related cases are currently scheduled for  
7 September 9, 2016, at 11:00 a.m. On August 1 and 2, 2016, the parties filed a stipulation and  
8 proposed order in the ten transferred cases only, requesting that the case management conferences  
9 in the ten transferred cases be moved to September 23, 2016 at 11:00 a.m. The Court GRANTS  
10 this request. The initial case management conferences in the following cases are HEREBY  
11 RESCHEDULED to September 23, 2016 at 11:00 a.m.: *Landin v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04174-  
12 JSW; *Hall v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04175-JSW; *Flores v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04176-JSW;  
13 *Davis v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04177-JSW; *Grimes v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04178-JSW;  
14 *McBride v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04179-JSW; *Elkins v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04180-JSW; *Paez*  
15 *v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04181-JSW; *Cook v. Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04182-JSW; *Huffman v.*  
16 *Comcast Corp.*, 16-cv-04183-JSW.

17 Additionally, the Court *sua sponte* RESCHEDULES the further case management  
18 conferences in the other eight related cases to September 23, 2016 at 11:00 a.m. See *Canaday v.*  
19 *Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04648-JSW; *Ortega v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04676-JSW; *Williams v.*  
20 *Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04732-JSW; *Valencia v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04771-JSW; *Coleman v.*  
21 *Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04782-JSW; *Nelson v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04793-JSW; *DuBois v.*  
22 *Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04809-JSW; and *Peters v. Comcast Corp.*, 15-cv-04869-JSW.

23 The joint case management statement in each of the related cases is due September 16,  
24 2016. The parties are encouraged to file a single joint case management statement in all of the  
25 related cases, which may have separate subsections for case-specific topics. The parties may also  
26 file case-specific joint statements as necessary. If the parties file the same case management  
27 statement in multiple cases, the parties should file only a single chambers copy, not a duplicate  
28 chambers copy for each case.

1       **3. The Court Defers Ruling on Whether the Stayed Cases Are Related.**

2              On July 13, 2016, the Court ordered the parties to meet and confer to consider whether two  
3 additional cases, *Johnson v. Comcast of California/Colorado/Washington I., Inc.*, No. 10-cv-  
4 04147-JSW, and *Poole v. Comcast Corporation*, No. 13-cv-03772-JSW, are related to *Canaday*  
5 and all other cases related to *Canaday*. *Johnson* and *Poole* are stayed pending final resolution of  
6 *Fayerweather v. Comcast Corporation and Comcast of Contra Costa, Inc.*, Superior Court of  
7 California in and for Contra Costa County No. C-08-01470. The parties in *Johnson* and *Poole*  
8 have been ordered to submit status reports to this court every 120 days.

9              In response to the Court's order, the parties request that the stay of *Johnson* and *Poole*  
10 remain in place for sixty days, to permit the parties to discuss voluntary resolution of these two  
11 cases. The parties request that the Court defer addressing the question of whether *Johnson* and  
12 *Poole* should be related to *Canaday* and all other cases related to *Canaday* while the stay remains  
13 in place. The Court GRANTS this request.


14       **4. The Parties Shall File a Further Status Report in the Stayed Cases.**

15              The parties in *Johnson* and *Poole* SHALL file a further joint status report no later than  
16 October 3, 2016. In addition to any other issues that the parties may address in the joint status  
17 report, the parties shall address: (1) whether *Johnson* and *Poole* should be related to *Canaday* and  
18 all other cases related to *Canaday*; and (2) whether *Johnson* and *Poole* should remain stayed.

19       **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20              Dated: August 4, 2016

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEFFREY S. WHITE  
United States District Judge